

## REMARKS

Claims 124-144 remain pending in the present application. Claim 124 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 124, 128-131, 136-138 and 141-144 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jean ('294). Claims 124, 128-131, 136-138 and 141-144 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Waters ('006). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 124 has been amended to define the first stationary rail as having first and second ends. A fence extends generally perpendicular to the first and second stationary rails and it is connected to the movable rails. Movement of the first and second movable rails with respect to the stationary rails between a first position where the fence is between the two ends of the stationary rail and a second position where the fence is located beyond one of the two ends are maintained in a synchronized manner due to the first and second cables.

Jean '294 discloses a drawing board having pulleys and cables, but the straight edge attachment 6 cannot extend beyond an end of the table. Waters '006 discloses a fence 10 which is movable along a table 12 with the fence being attached to a cable 26. Similar to Jean '294, the fence in Waters '006 is not capable of being positioned beyond an end of the table because the cable 26 to which the fence is attached only extends across most of the width of the table itself.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 124, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 128-131, 136-138 and 141-144, which ultimately depend from Claim 124, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 124-144 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waters ('006) who shows a table saw with most of the recited limitations. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As detailed above, Claim 124 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over Waters '006. Bartlett, et al. '510 discloses telescopic rails but the system in Bartlett, et al. '510 also does not teach the positioning of the fence beyond the end of the table. Therefore, Waters '006 taken alone or in combination with Bartlett, et al. '510 does not disclose, teach or suggest the invention now defined in amended Claim 124.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 124, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Clams 125-144, which ultimately depend from Claim 124, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 17, 2005

By

  
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg